

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application and entry of the after-final amendment pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Clarifying amendments have been made to Claims 21, 22, and 24. Claims 1-14, and 16-20 have been canceled. In an Advisory Action mailed February 22, 2005, the position was set forth that newly proposed or amended Claims 15, and 21-24 from an After Final Amendment submitted January 18, 2005, would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claims. Accordingly, applicant is hereby resubmitting the newly proposed or amended Claims 15, and 21-24 that were the subject of the Advisory Action, and have canceled all non-allowable claims. For the benefit of the Examiner, and to clarify the record in the application, Applicant is providing below arguments where applicable that were previously submitted in the first After Final Amendment dated January 18, 2005. Some changes have been made based on additional claims that were canceled. The arguments were as follows.

Claim Objections

Claims 10 and 24 stand objected to for minor informalities. Specifically, the Examiner suggests at Claim 10, line 2, to delete the phrase "the wheel base of the bicycle frame" and insert "to the bicycle frame's wheel base." In response to the claim objection, applicant has canceled Claim 10, rendering this objection moot. The Examiner further suggests at Claim 24, line 3, to delete the phrase "the bicycle frame" and insert the phrase "a bicycle." In response to this claim objection, applicant has amended Claim 24 to recite "a bicycle frame." Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim objection to Claim 24.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 21 stands rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that several recited limitations lack antecedent basis. Accordingly, applicant has amended Claim 21 to delete the phrases "having a transmission including a flexible drive

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>LLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

element", "for creating resistance against the transmission", "for selectively tensioning the flexible drive element", and "a portion of which supports the flexible drive element." Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to this claim. Applicant has canceled Claim 6 rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harnden et al. in view of Hu. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harnden et al. in view of Hu and further in view of Baatz. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bursik in view of Kim. Applicant has canceled Claims 1-5, thus rendering the rejections to these claims moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to Claim 22.

Claim 22

Claim 22 has been amended to recite a support frame having a bicycle frame mounting structure and a flywheel mounting structure, a bicycle frame having rear fork members detachably coupled to the bicycle frame mounting structure of the support frame about a common first axis, a flywheel rotatably coupled about a second axis to the flywheel mounting structure of the support frame in-between the rear fork members of the bicycle frame, wherein the second axis is different from the first axis, and a transmission including a flexible drive element. Claim 22 has been further amended to recite that the support frame includes a tensioning device for selectively tensioning the flexible drive element "by adjusting the distance between the first and second axes."

As discussed above with regard to Claim 6, Kim teaches a spring loaded chain tension adjusting means 944 that tensions a conventional drive chain member 995. See Figure 3. However, Kim fails to teach a tensioning device that selectively tensions the flexible drive element by adjusting the distance between the axis of the head tube member 780 or the seat tube

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>SM</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100


member 810 and the axis of the axled rotating road means 710. Applicant further asserts that Bursik fails to teach the deficiencies of Kim.

Under Section 103, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established only if the cited references, alone or in combination, teach each of the limitations of the recited claims. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As was discussed above, Applicant asserts that the proposed combination of Bursik and Kim fails to teach or suggest each and every recited element of amended Claim 22. Accordingly, applicant asserts that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the pending rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Thus, applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, and the allowance of all pending claims. If any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>




Brandon C. Stallman  
Registration No. 46,468  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1708

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Group Art Unit 3764, Examiner Tam M. Nguyen, at facsimile number 703.872.9306 on March 15, 2005.

Date:

March 15, 2005



BCS:vas

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100